



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,662	03/17/2004	Thomas J. Bachinski	77012-325797	2663

58506 7590 02/12/2008

FAEGRE & BENSON, LLP
PATENT DOCKETING
90 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET
2200 WELLS FARGO CENTER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

BARTOSIK, ANTHONY N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3635

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

02/12/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

e-OfficeActionHNI@faegre.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/802,662	Applicant(s) BACHINSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner ANTHONY N. BARTOSIK	Art Unit 3635	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) ANTHONY N. BARTOSIK. (3) Adrin Eggen.
 (2) Richard Chilcot. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 24 January 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lauter et al (US 7,055,186).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Lauter et al. (US 7,055,186) reference of the first office action was discussed. It was agreed that changing the claims to include the structure of a fireplace would define the claims over the prior art used within the rejection. It was also noted that the Hechler (US 5,826,357) reference, cited in the IDS, is substantial prior art and should be taken into consideration when responding to the first office action..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Richard E. Chilcot, Jr./

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. Examiner's signature, if required